The MILITANT

Semi-Monthly Organ of the
Communist League of America
(Opposition)

VOL. II. No. 13 | NEW YORK, N. Y., AUGUST 15, 1929. | PRICE 5 CENTS

UNITED FRONT FOR GASTONIA

Fight the Frame-up! Defend the Right to Organize and Strike!

The change of venue and the delay in the trial of the Gastonia strikers is a slight advantage for the defense of which the most should be made. It offers a breathing space in the preparation and organization of the defense movement, provides a little more time to rally a broader and more powerful movement and to correct errors in the defense tactics. All this is important and valuable, for a defense movement before a trial has ten times more significance than after conviction. This is the lesson of all great labor cases from Moyer and Haywood to Sacco and Vanzetti.

The change of venue also has a value in the removal of the trial from the lynching atmosphere systematically worked up against the prisoners in Gaston County. But this should not be the occasion for illusions. The capitalist courts remain what they were—instruments of capitalist frame-up justice—and the optimistic predictions of a "fair trial" by the Civil Liberties Union have to be rejected out of hand because they tend to disarm the workers in a bitter life and death class fight. To condemn this attitude it is not necessary to represent the change of venue and the delay as a blow at the defense. This is merely irresponsible foolishness, since the defense fought for this decision. Fundamentally the case stands where it stood before, with the class relations and the main issues the same and with a slight improvement in the position of the defense.

The Gastonia case is a labor case, and a case of the classic frame-up of the workers. The right to organize and strike and the fight against the frame-up system are the real issues involved. All the evidence shows that the police militia and thugs of the mill owners were the instigators of violence against the workers. There is no proof that the fatal shots were fired by the strikers. No one has been so identified, no one has admitted such responsibility and it is certain that no such proof can be brought against the strike leaders. The case thus has all the characteristics of a typical labor frame-up.

The whole nature of the case indicates the rallying slogans of the defense movement:

Fight the Frame-up!

Safeguard the workers' right to organize and strike!

Slogans are the guiding line for action and it is of the utmost importance that they be formulated correctly. In our opinion it is not correct to make "the right of self defense" the central slogan of the campaign. An entirely different set of circumstances would be necessary for this. Such a leading slogan would apply only if the actual responsibility for the fatal shooting were clearly established and assumed by the defendents. This is not the case, and in the absence of these conditions it is false to put this slogan as the guiding line of the campaign. It tends to narrow down the movement of defense and it assumes a revolutionary atmosphere and class development which does not exist. It sounds "radical", but being false and unrealistic it does not serve radical ends.

The fundamental interests of the working class are at stake in the Gastonia trial as they were in the time of Moyer and Haywood, Ettor and Giovanitti, Mooney and Billings, Centralia and Sacco and Vanzetti. The nature of the case and the interests of the working class and of the prisoners call for a broad united front movement of defense. This idea must be the central strategy of the campaign.

United front movements do not spring out of the ground. They must be organized. How is it to be organized in this case—exclusively from below? No, this is a wrong approach. The united front from below alone follows only from the failure to secure any cooperation from leading elements in non-Communist organizations, after a conscientious attempt has been made, and after refusal of the leaders to cooperate in a united action has been definitely established before the workers belonging to and following the other organizations. It cannot be said that such is the case now in regard to Gastonia because the attempt has not been made.

On the other hand, numerous organizations in the working class movement—I. W. W., the new progressive movement, numerous unions, S. P., Anarchists, S. L. P., etc.,—have issued declarations of support for the Gastonia defendents. As matters stand now those elements in these organizations who really want to help, and there are no doubt many of them, are not organized and those who are not sincere in their declarations are furnished with a good excuse for doing nothing. The right move by the International Labor Defense which is in charge of the defense can straighten out the situation, mobilize those who want to help and show up those who do not.

The I. L. D. should make formal proposals to all organizations in the working class movement for united action regardless of political differences. Along with such formal proposals to the official leadership of the various organizations there should be a public appeal to all workers to cooperate in a genuine united front movement. The organization machinery for the united front movement should be "United Front Gastonia Defense Conferences" patterned on the Sacco-Vanzetti Conferences, the Passaic Strike Conferences and the old Moyer-Haywood Conferences, all of which followed the same line. It is false to attempt to form these conferences as direct adjuncts of the I. L. D. This procedure, as experience has already shown, attracts only organizations under the direct influence of the Party, thrusts aside all elements at war with the Communists and leaves the conservative workers untouched. Under the present conditions a really broad and powerful movement cannot be organized on this line.

The Gastonia case is a matter of desperate seriousness for the entire labor movement. Workers' lives and basic working class rights are at stake. Such issues cannot be a factional monopoly or plaything, Factionalism has no place in such great issues of the class struggle. Faction interests are alien and hostile to the interests of the case.

The Communist League of America, in common with all class conscious elements in the labor movement, wants to take part in a united movement for the defense of Gastonia. If we have resorted to criticism of the management of the case it is only because the management has thus far failed to lead in the direction of a united movement, because it has violated the basic lines necessary for the organization of such a movement, because it has followed a sectarian policy inimical to the interests of the workers' fight for the Gastonia prisoners, because it has pushed aside the cooperation of those who want to help. The rejection of the delegates of the Communist League of America at the Chicago Conference of the I. L. D. is a case in point—an example of criminal factionalism for which we know no precedent in American labor history. The failure to reply to the letter of the I. W. W. of July 18th offering cooperation, as printed in "Solidarity" for August 14th, likewise deserves the strongest condemnation. The Communists rightly criticised the Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee for its narrow policy, but this committee never made the mistake of directly refusing the cooperation of any group.

We repeat again the sentiment of all class conscious workers: Organize all progressive forces in the labor movement—and all honest sympathizing elements—into a single united movement for the defeat of the Gastonia frame-up and the defense of the workers' right to organize and strike.

National Committee
The Communist League of America (Opposition)

Danger Signals in the East

A certain sharpening of the situation is evident in the present dispute between the Soviet Union and the Chinese counter-revolution around the question of the Chinese Eastern Railway. Troop mobilizations on both sides of the Manchurian border are being increased. Shots have been exchanged by contending patrols, in which a number of Red Army soldiers were killed. The opposing forces consisted for the most part of White Guard Russians who are operating against the Soviets with the covert support of Chiang Kai-Shek and Co. The Chinese reactionaries, and the White Guards in particular, are working hard to involve Russia in a war that may have tremendous consequences.

Nevertheless, the main indications point to the unlikelihood of a serious war situation developing. The imperialist press, and the imperialist powers, while they jockey for more advantageous positions in the dispute, give no direct support to the action of the Chinese. Russia has been maneuvered into the unfortunate position where it is defending its economic claims to property located on foreign soil and to the inviolability of treaty rights. This is a dangerous position for the Workers' Republic.

The imperialists are opposed to China's seizure of the railway because it strengthens the precedents for similar actions against the concessions and extra-territoriality "rights" of Japan, England, France and the United States. The imperialists want to use Russia's present attitude to justify their hold upon the economic and financial resources of China, and rob the Soviet Union (and the revolutionary movement as a whole) of the moral basis for protesting against these holdings.

Every worker will have as his first duty to lend every ounce of support to the Soviet Union to defend it from intervention and attack. But Russia will not find it possible to arouse the sentiments of the workers of the world to fight for Russian economic claims outside of the Soviet Union, on foreign soil. The fact that the railway was built by Russian (czarist) money, or that Russian participation was guaranteed in a treaty with the reactionary and defunct government of Chang Tso Lin, or that the railway is necessary for Russian transports to Vladivostock, are not valid arguments for a revolutionary workers' government. From the proletarian point of view, Russia has as little claim to the railway as Chiang Kai-Shek; it belongs to the workers and peasants of China who will justly claim it when they come to power. Unless this is stated frankly and openly we should be deceiving and misleading the workers.

We are opposed to the atmosphere in which the dispute is being conducted by Stalin. It is the atmosphere of bourgeois diplomacy, in which the existence of negotiations (that were actually carried on between Russia and China for a time) are denied. It has nothing in common with the exemplary conduct of the Bolsheviks at Brest-Litovsk in 1918, charged with the internationalist spirit of Lenin and Trotsky. In 1918, the open and frank appeals of the Bolsheviks really led to the defeat of the German Junkers and the beginning of the German revolution Stalin's present policy in China will never yield such a harvest. The Chinese proletariat and peasantry cannot and will not be rallied to overthrow the counter-revolution, to support the Soviet Union, to the standard of socialism by appealing to them to fight for Russian economic claims in China.

Neither is it correct to say that the main danger of war now exists in an attack on the Soviet Union by imperialism. The main danger of war today exists primarily in the growing intensity of the conflicts between British and American imperialism. The chief danger to the dictatorship of the proletariat lies in the steady penetration of Russian economic life by imperialist concessionaries, the growing strength and influence of the Kulak, the Nepman and the state bureaucracy, of the Thermidorian and counter-revolutionary elements in the country. That is what threatens the Russian revolution most acutely today.

The Stalinist press has nothing to say in answer to our viewpoint than to foully accuse the Opposition of being "allies of Chang Kai-Shek". This will deceive no one. When the Opposition was demanding a break with Chiang Kai-Shek as an enemy of the revolution in China and Russia, when Chiang Kai-Shek was strangling the Chinese working class and peasantry and beginning to drown it in a sea of blood, it was Stalin and Bucharin who maintained a most intimate alliance with him, who glorified him as the "revolution-

(*Continued on Page* 4)

Where Is the Left Wing Going?

An Answer to William Z. Foster with a Footnote on his Political Biography

By James P. Cannon

William Z. Foster, who has succeeded Lovestone as the chief of American Stalinism, makes his debut as an unterrified warrior against "counter-revolutionary Trotskyism", after a long and discreet silence on the subject, in the July number of "The Communist". The publication of Foster's article ("Right Tendencies at the Trade Union Unity Conference") opens a debate on the trade union question which the Stalinists avoided as long as possible.

In his first attack on the Opposition Communists Foster justifies his appointment to the leadership of American Stalinism by an exhibition of those talents and methods which he perfected in the school of Gompers and which have contributed not a little to the corruption of the Communist movement in America since his belated adhesion to it. The Communist movement will be the gainer by this forced discussion of specific questions at issue and by the occasion it offers to examine the personal qualities and the history of Foster which have made him the logical "successor" to Lovestone as the warden of the Stalin barracks.

The first task in replying to him is to clear away the fog and put the questions as they are. Foster tries to represent matters as though we are opposed to organizing the unorganized. That seems absolutely incredible to anyone familiar with the facts. But Foster, evidently proceeding on the theory that nobody reads or remembers what he reads, puts it down in type as the keystone of his argument against us. And to make the case "stronger" he links our position with that of Lovestone whom yesterday he helped to expel us.

A few facts will suffice to dispose of this falsification. "The Communist" for July, 1928 contained an article by me, which was a digest of my speech at the May, 1928 Plenum of the C. E. C. In this article, which outlines views consistently maintained since that time, I insisted on a course "to put the main emphasis and center of gravity in its trade union work on the organization of the unorganized and the preparation for strikes". This was the main theme of my article, although the necessity of combatting any tendency to leave the old unions was also underscored. Foster's attempt to represent us as opposed to this line and to connect us with Lovestone who really opposed it, is quite amazing when it is recalled that the same issue of "The Communist" in which my article appeared also contains an article by Foster, as a sort of reply to me, written, as the introduction states, at the instruction of Lovestone C. E. C. and "expressing the C. E. C. position."

Our trade union position does not change from day to day and we maintain now, as before, despite the incalculable damage being done by the adventurist and irresponsible policy of the Party, that the organization of the unorganized must be the first point on the left wing program in the present situation. This idea is brought out in our platform and it runs through a dozen or more articles in The Militant dealing with various phases of trade union work.

THE REAL DIFFERENCES

But this matter does not end with Foster's falsification and our exposure of it. The differences between us on this point are real enough and they consist in this:

For us the organization of the unorganized and the formation of new unions is only one phase—although at present the most important phase—of our program and is indissolubly connected with the work in the old unions and the slogan of trade union unity. For the Stalinists the formation of new unions and the empty chatter about a new revolutionary trade union center have become a trade union program in themselves.

For fear of facing the whole issue this has not yet been stated in clear and definite programmatic form. But it is the plain implication of all the talk nowadays, and it is the practice. The T. U. E. L. as a left wing in the old unions does not exist any more. The nature of the current propaganda precludes any serious work in the A. F. of L. One could easily compile a page of quotations from the Party press to show that the policy is understood to mean that we are to *join* the new unions and *leave* the A. F. of L. One quotation from the pen of the eminent Patrick H. Toohey, Secretary-Treasurer of the National Miners' Union, in the Daily Worker of May 24, illustrates the drift:

"The many thousands of honest workers who are still in the A. F. of L. will quickly learn that they are being betrayed *and will leave it* to join with the unorganized workers of the entire country." (our emphasis).

Foster, the most careful writer, expert in the use of the qualifying clause, past-master in the art of "leaving the door open" so that his words can be interpreted to mean one thing or the direct opposite—depending on the way the cat jumps—furnishes the inspiration for the conclusions of the cruder Tooheys. In the Daily Worker of May 13 Foster wrote as follows:

"By the same token that *it would be wrong to draw these individual workers* into the corrupt A. F. of L. unions, *so it would be incorrect to try to affiliate them collectively* through the new unions to the A. F. of L. *The A. F. of L. leadership does not want such revolutionary unions* and even if it should in any case accept them it would only be to destroy them."

These two quotations are the same in essence and they are both wrong because they set up a dogma which cannot always be followed. If we are in principle opposed to drawing *individual workers* into the A. F. of L., if we consider it incorrect to try to *affiliate them collectively*, and if this attitude is motivated, as Foster motivates it, by the fact, that "the A. F. of L. leadership does not want such revolutionary unions", then Toohey is correct also about the necessity of the honest workers *leaving* the A. F. of L.. Green and Company do not want them either. With such views how can a left wing be consolidated for a stubborn fight in the old unions? It cannot be done, and because of such views which now dominate the Party policy it is not being done.

These tactics are false. They spell isolation and defeat for the left wing, the strengthening of the reactionary strangle-hold on the unions and the eventual defeat of the program for organizing the unorganized. And of all those responsible for the damage these false tactics are doing to the future of the Party, Foster is the most culpable. He is not one of those brainless wind-bags who are able to talk themselves into the belief that the new "Revolutionary Trade Union Center" is just what the workers are waiting for. He knows better, and supports a false policy out of factional expediency and personal opportunism. This is a crime against the working class.

THE PROGRESSIVES

In his article in "The Communist" Foster gingerly touches on the question of the united front with the progressive elements in the unions against the reactionaries which was the main strategy of the Party in the trade unions since 1921 and which Foster advocated in his book "Misleaders of Labor" as the key to the conquest of the unions.

Now Foster dismisses the whole strategy with a few words, repudiates seven years of Party trade union work under his direction and dumps overboard the book which embodied his settled conclusions on the trade union movement—all in a few sentences which make no attempt to explain the error of the old policy or the reasons for the new one. Everything is covered with the soul-saving formula: we made a mistake and the R. I. L. U. corrected us. It would be more merciful and humane to "educate" the left wing workers with a club than to slug them with such methods.

The new progressive movement in the trade unions is a symptom of rank and file pressure which will very probably show greater vitality in the future. The Communists should regard it fundamentally from this standpoint and steer a course toward contact with it, regardless of the shady character of some of those represented in its present leadership. Since when did this become wrong and why?

Only a year ago, in his article in the July 1928 "Communist", referred to above, Foster wrote:

"The middle group will tend to organize and cooperate with the left wing. The so-called Muste Group, while not in itself large, is an evidence of this tendency. To consolidate the real opposition forces in the old unions, is the task of the T. U. E. L."

The explanation of the error in these conceptions is Foster's task, not ours. We still maintain them. But he tries to avoid that duty by ascribing the policy of the past exclusively to us and, with characteristic generosity, by giving us "credit" for some particularly gross mistake of his own.

"Cannon . . .was one of the very worst defenders of the erroneous united front policy of the T. U. E. L. He understood it and fought for it to mean that we should make alliances with every crook and faker in the labor movement who made even a pretense of being in opposition to the ruling labor bureaucracy. This was the substance of his conception of trade union work."

Who? Where? When? This is a very strong accusation which ought to be supported by some facts and proofs. Since Foster fails to supply them, we will make up the deficiency. The only time and place this was a serious issue dividing the Central Committee was in the Needle Trades and particularly in the I. L. G. W. U. In 1925 when Sigman was in a conflict with other sections of the bureaucracy, over questions of patronage, after he had expelled the Left wing, the Foster faction proposed to make a combination with the Sigman forces to secure a majority at the 1925 convention in Philadelphia. We fought this utterly unprincipled combination which threatened to undermine the moral and ideological foundations of the Left wing and combined with Ruthenberg to defeat it. The whole story is told in the minutes of the Political Committee for that period. There it appears on the agenda a half a dozen times with a half a dozen motions from us prohibiting it. We challenge Foster to make these minutes public. This will be far more convincing than general accusations which cannot be supported.

But, while we fought against the abominable horse-trade with Sigman and others of the same stripe which Foster also proposed, we declined to join in the orgy of purity and repentance which came afterward and which wanted to do away with all dealings with all fakers under all circumstances. We were, and are, against this theory because it condemns the Left wing to sterility and destroys its maneuvering capacity. It is in reality only the reverse side of the Sigman proposal and is almost equally harmful.

THE SLOGAN OF UNITY

One of the greatest weaknesses in the current trade union policy of the Party is the withdrawal of the slogan of unity. This was a central slogan of the Party and one of its mightiest weapons in the fight against the reactionaries. The slogan of unity was one of the most effective means of mobilizing the masses in the needle trades under the left wing banner. And conversely, although there are other factors, the decline of left wing power and influence and the revival of the rights in this field are closely related to the dropping of this slogan.

These light-hearted reversals of basic policy are made all the more reprehensible by the failure to offer any explanations. They are carried out in a purely administrative way by decision of committees as though the masses did not exist. The education of the Party is stifled by these methods and the masses cannot understand what the Communists want. In these conditions the reactionaries and the socialists grow and consolidate at the expense of the Communists, and the Right Wing in the Party is nurtured.

This process, now clearly visible, is part of the fruit of the "new line" of counterfeit Leftism. The National Conference of the T. U. E. L. can really serve the cause of the workers if it calls a halt to this course and steers the trade union work of the Left wing back onto the main line of revolutionary policy. A formal ratification of the adventurist tactics which Foster and others are now propagating will weaken the position of the Left wing still more and make its recovery more painful and difficult.

* * *

Stalin Centrism selects the instruments which are qualified to serve its mission which is to befoul the banner of Communism and destroy the Communist International. It attracts to its service those who adapt themselves easily and swim with the current. It creates a happy hunting ground for the bureaucrat and careerist. It bestows the marshal's baton on those who can reconcile contradictions and change positions in the shortest time. The consecration of Foster as the new American chief of Stalinism is not without logic and a reason. His past has prepared him for the present, as an outline of his career will show. His record is a record of zig-zags and changes from right to left according to the mutations of the working class movement. Above all others he has shown that he knows how to adapt himself. And this is the first requirement of a Stalinist overseer.

FOSTER'S ZIG-ZAG RECORD

Foster began his career as a revolutionist, first in the Socialist Party and later in the I. W. W. This is an important fact to remember in connection with his later activities and allegiances. He left the I. W. W. in 1911 at a time of low ebb in the fortunes of that organization of militants and went to the A. F. of L. There, according to his own testimony and that of Gompers and Fitzpatrick before the Senate Committee investigating the Steel Strike, some extracts of which are printed on another page, he adapted himself to the philosophy of Gompers, so much that he found no obstacle in rising to high positions by official appointment.

During the war the tide ran strongly against the "Reds" and Foster, by his own testimony, went with it,—for the war. He who had been a revolutionist *fought on the other side of the barricades in those fate-*

THE MILITANT

Published twice a month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)
Address all mail to: P. O. Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y.
Publisher address at 332 18th Street, New York, N. Y.
Subscription rate: 1.00 per year. Foreign $1.50
5c per copy Bundle rates, 3c per copy.

Editor
James P. Cannon

Associate Editors:
Martin Abern
Max Shachtman
Maurice Spector

VOL. II. AUGUST 15, 1929 No. 13.

Entered as second-class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

2 YEARS AFTLR

Sacco and Vanzetti

This August 23rd will mark two years after the night when life was burned out of two of the finest spirits ever devoted to the great cause of the working class. On that night the cultured, respectable and frock-coated elite of Massachusetts civilization, and Fullers, Lowells and Thayers threw the switch that sent a fatal current through the tortured bodies of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti. The great thinkers and the masters who are kind enough to rule us looked on with open approbation or with a silence worse than assent. "It will teach the damned Reds a lesson."

THE LESSON OF CLASS JUSTICE

But it also taught hundreds of thousands of American workers a big lesson. The deadly electrical flame that seared the martyrs gave a ghastly illumination to the whole structure of prejudiced, vengeful class justice of the capitalists. There were undoubtedly millions of workers who could not convince themselves to the very last minute that the Massachusetts reactionaries would dare to go through with their hideous murder plans. The execution revealed to them that the ruling class hesitates at nothing to consolidate and retain its power to exploit the working class. The execution revealed to them the fact that the courts, juries, the whole system of American "democratic justice" is an instrument in the hands of one class alone for the persecution of another class; that intimidation, terror and legal murder are not the least of the weapons of the bourgeoisie.

Sacco and Vanzetti were murdered because they were working class fighters, devoted, selfless, and without fear. They were made an example of. They were led to the electric chair in the face of the protest of literally millions of workers in every part of the world. The American capitalist class, feeling secure in its almighty power, did not want to "lose face" by yielding to the pressure of the people.

The fight for the lives of the two martyrs proved over again that the working class can gain nothing by accomodating itself to the limitations of its class enemy, the capitalists. The "well-meaning liberals", the yellow socialists, and the anarchists who were so perturbed by the storm of the workers' mass movement, who wanted to fight for Sacco and Vanzetti by being respectable and very legal in the eyes of Coolidge, Fuller and Thayer, only stood in the way of the struggle and helped to lull the workers into false security and delusions that led to inaction. Wittingly or unwittingly, they played the cunning game of the Fullers. It was they who sought to split the united defense movement, who sought to soft-pedal on the militant struggle, who sought partisan ends by fighting in every way against the Communist elements who were the leaven and backbone of the movement. That must be remembered.

THE MOVEMENT MUST BE REVIVED

That gigantic movement which rallied hundreds of thousands and more to its banner showed that the healthy class instincts of the American workers had not been entirely blunted by a false "prosperity" and democratic illusions. It proved that the American workers can be aroused to march in unison for their class interests. Such a movement must be rivived. It is an imperative need. Sacco and Vanzetti were not the first and not the last. The capitalist class is working to make Gastonia another Boston. It still keeps Mooney and Billings buried in California. It still takes its toll of the Centralia I.W.W. for defending themselves from American Legion lynchers. Scores of other workers in this country and thousands throughout the world, add to the number of victims of capitalist class justice. For all these, and for those to come, the workers must be aroused to protest and act, the movement must be gathered and built.

The defense of the imprisoned imilitants is the first duty of the working class. A stubborn fight for the release of the class war fighters will serve as the monument we erect to Sacco and Vanzetti. Their names have been imperishable symbols of revolt. Their murder was the last word spoken on them by their executioners. The working class has not yet spoken its last word.

Honor to the glorious fighters who have fallen! We never forget.

---

ful days. The man whom Stalin has appointed to "lead" the fight against the war danger, was for winning the last war "at all costs", "bought either $450 or $500 worth of bonds" made dozens of speeches and "carried on a regular campaign" in the stock-yards "to help make he loans a success."

These are the credentials which qualify him to denounce us as "counter-revolutionists" and "renegades". They are not unlike the credentials of other leaders of the Stalin slander squad throughout the International.

In 1921 the left tide in the labor movement was flowing and Foster discovered the Russian Revolution—and that not without considerable persuasion and inducement. When Ralph Chaplin and the writer went to see him early in that year he was still hesitant and evasive. He replied to a direct question as to his belief in the proletarian revolution with the strange words, as I remember them: "Well, I used to have a lot of faith. I walked twenty miles once to vote the Socialist ticket".

His entry into the Party in 1921, following a trip to Russia and an agreement to support and build up the T. U. E. L. was an undoubted advantage to the movement just emerging from the underground and seeking contact with the masses. His trade union prestige and connections were a great factor in giving life to the trade union tactics adopted at the Unity convention earlier in that year and which retain their validity today. Even his conceptions of "dual unionism" as the cause of all the evils in the radical movement served a purpose in correcting the sectarian currents on this question.

As a Party leader he failed to justify the hopes placed in him and was not long in demonstrating that he had learned more from Gompers than from Lenin. His methods were marked by an ingrained and incurable dishonesty. His inability to put any question squarely, his systematic muddling and misrepresentation of issues and his subordination of the task of educating the Party to the immediate aim of securing votes in a faction struggle had a sad effect on the workers around him. Their political development was arrested in its most elementary stages, and what became finally crystallized as the Foster faction was always a picture of political impotence. His influence as a political force in the Party dwindled progressively and the new role of leadership he now enjoys could only have been conferred by appointment.

The reaction in the Communist International represented by the dominance of apparatus Centrism, is flowing now and Foster is riding with it. In political questions his chief characteristic has been adaptability, incapacity to withstand pressure and maintain a position as a minority. He has always been fighting for power but always sacrificing or adapting his position to the exigencies of that fight. A record of the various positions he has taken on disputed Party questions would be a chart of shifts in pressure from one side to another in the course of the struggles. He used to be against "dual unions" to a dogmatic extreme intolerable for one who tried to view the labor movement from a Marxist standpoint. Now the "Left" tide in the Comintern has carried him to a directly opposite position. The same on the question of the progressives. It is really hard to believe that the man who talks so radical now was an ally—and more than an ally—of Fitzpatrick a few short years ago. A new change in Comintern policy, which under the present regime is apt to come anytime on 24 hours notice, will find Foster on the bandwagon ahead of everybody shouting for the "new line" and denouncing anyone who holds on to the slogans he is promoting today. No one would welcome a new shift in policy to the Right more than Foster. He has an innate conservatism and talks radical now, because he must, with tongue in cheek, like an atheist priest repeating his prayers.

Foster fits well into the world machine of Stalin which has replaced the original staff of Lenin's International. Between his present role and his old one there is an intimate connection. Such leaders will last as long as Centrism maintains itself in the International and will go down with it.

Bucharin Formally Ousted

The official Party press has finally announced that the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. decided to "relieve" Bucharin, Humbert-Droz, Serra and Gitlow from the secretariat, and to expel Lovestone, Jilek, and Comrade Maurice Spector from the Executive. Comrade Spector is the only one of those named to be expelled for his support of the Bolshevik-Leninists (Opposition).

The removal of Bucharin, which seems to have been the sole accomplishment of the Tenth Plenum, is of little interest now. The delegates to the sessions had nothing to say about it and the mechanical raising of their hands was the purest and most needless formality. For the last five years Bucharin has been praised to the skies by the Right-Centrist bloc in the Comintern. He was put into Zinoviev's place as chairman of the C.I., when Zinoviev joined in the Opposition Bloc in the Russian Party. At the Sixth World Congress, held only a year ago, Bucharin was the spokesman for the Executive Committee and for the Russian Party. He gave the political report, and the program report. He was re-elected chairman. His removal from the C.I. was decided in secret caucus by Stalin a long time gao. His actual removal took place some months ago, again by Stalin decision. The Tenth Plenum only served to rubber-stamp enthusiastically the decision with which they had nothing to do. When the Opposition and The Militant reported that Bucharin was already slated for removal, the official Stalinist press, and all of the functionaries from Stalin to Foster and Lovestone, accused us of counter-revolutionary slander and "speculation" on differences in the Russian Party, which they swore did not exist!

PEACE TALK

Smoke-screen for War

The temporary suspension of cruiser building by the MacDonald government in England, followed by the Hoover regime in the United Staates, as a result of the conversations between the Laborite and Dawes, the American Ambassador at London, has opened a "new era of peace and harmony" for the hundredth time since the World War. The liberal capitalist press, led by the Nation and New Republic, are puffing themselves blue in the face with glee. The socialist press, trailing a poor second as usual, is welcoming the action as a further peaceful step towards the brotherhood of man and the abolition of bloodshed and turmoil. Norman Thomas opens up on the first page of the New Leader with pious joy in his heart at the thought of the $30,000,000 saved for the prosperity of his beloved taxpayer every time a cruiser is discarded, and on the last page the cynical Oneal chuckles with maudlin editorial approval of the drubbing Hoover administered in his letter—"clever and deadly in its logic"—to McNutt, the commander of the American Legion.

A WORLD ARMED TO THE TEETH

We have had enough of these "new eras", however, to be more than sceptical of their realization either through MacDonald or Hoover. World capitalism has been disarming regularly, every half year, since the end of the World War, disarming to such an extent, in fact, that history can find no parallel for a world bristling so belligerently with the most efficient armaments as today. The sum total of all the disarmament conferences up to the present day has been the scrapping of old, outmoded and useless weapons of war, the expenditure of ever-increasing proportions of national budgets for chemical and air equipment, a continual series of "small wars" of the big powers against their smaller victims, and preparations for "big wars" against each other or unitedly against the Soviet Union.

The present proposal to discard a few cruisers has about as much significance as an agreement to discard bows and arrows in the Spanish-American war. All the cruisers in the world may be scrapped without it making very much difference, for as Mr. George Young, a noted member of the British Labor Party and an old hand at diplomacy under half a dozen British governments, said at the Williamstown Institute of Politics: "Cruisers will soon be about as useless as battleships." He continues:

"In tackling the most expensive and least efficient branches first, the danger is that more and more there will be a concentration on the most novel and effiçient weapons, the submarines, the airplanes and poison gas.

"Moreover, these novel weapons to which national armaments may be reduced in ten or twenty years, depend for their effectiveness on rapid and ruthless offensives against the civilian population. Therefore the net result of the present movement may be to make warfare wholly destructive to civilization, and history teaches us that the more destructive weapons of war become, the greater the temptation to use them."—(New York Times, August 5, 1929.)

Mr Young is correct when he indicates that the junking of cruisers is merely one way of improving the efficiency of war.

AMERICA'S "PACIFISM" IN EUROPE

There is yet another reason for America's "pacifism"—in Europe. The United States is determinedly interested in having the European powers pay their debts to Uncle Shylock. Heavy military and naval expenditures diminish the chances of rapid repayment of debts to the United States. Without for a moment surrendering its aggressive intentions in Europe, the United States is all to the good when less money is spent by European capitalism on war preparations and more is left to pay the American debt. As a concession, the United States can even afford to discard ship for ship in return. The American imperialists are as well aware of the following fact as we are: In case of a war, it is not the superiority by even a half a dozen units of this or that arm of warfare that will decide the victory, but the tremendous predominance of American industry over that of any other power. We are not living in the days of knights in armour, and it is the steel mill and the chemical plants that decide the outcome of a military conflict.

Modern capitalism can just as soon disarm and inaugurate permanent peace as it can stop exploiting the working class. Militarism and war are inseparable parts of capitalism itself. MacDonald's "pacific" gestures and Hoover's balloons-full of hot air serve a good purpose to the master class: they help to delude the masses into bitterly false hopes of peace under capitalism. It is not in "disarmament" negotiations that American capitalism shows its real face. It is in its brutal oppression of the islands of the Caribbean and the Pacific, its military invasion of Nicaragua, its boldly aggressive challenge to the European powers contained in the Hawley-Smoot tariff, and in kindred actions. Capitalism will be disarmed only when it is swept out of its seat of power. The Russian workers have shown the way.

Who Is Leading the Comintern To-day?

By L. D. Trotsky

Nothing characterizes better the transformation of the official Party of the Soviet Union than its attitude towards the problems of the international revolution. For the majority of the apparatus people, the Communist International has become an office to be attended to by those engaged for it. In these last years, the leadership has systematically disaccustomed the Party from interesting itself effectively in the inner life of the international labor movement, more particularly in the world Communist Parties. It must be said frankly: the present journalistic information in the U. S. S. R. on the events taking place within the international working class is distinctly inferior to the information given by the best organs of the social democracy before the war. It is not possible to put any faith in the present essentially official information whose purpose always conforms with the momentary interests of the leading circles. One must forego following from day to day the development of the labor movement and its internal struggles. Certain events are suppressed, others, on the contrary, are deliberately exaggerated; but even this is episodic.

After a long period, in which one Party or another has almost disappeared from the range of vision of our press, there suddenly appears a "new danger", a new "deviation",—a catastrophe! The reader, however, learns of this catastrophe only after the leading organs concerned have taken "their measures". The reader, (that is, the Party), is simply informed that the catastrophe, whose approach he had not the least notion of, has been happily liquidated thanks to the decision taken yesterday by the Presidium of the International and that the national section involved is again assured of a "monolithic" development. The monotonous repetition of this precedure stupefies the reader and plunges him into indifference. The average member of the Party begins to regard the successive catastrophes in the International, as those in his own Party, as the peasant looks upon the hailstorm or the drought: Nothing can be done about it, we must have patience.

It is obvious that his phenomenon is conceivable only because of the heavy defeats of the international revolution, the sense of these defeats, moreover, never having been explained to the masses of the Party, so as not to disclose the bankruptcy of the leadership. Only the great ideological capital, moral and political, inherited from the past and the fact of the existence of the workers' state, still makes it possible for the International to include in the ranks of its organization throughout the world (excluding the U.S.S.R.), 400 to 500,000 members at the very most.

THEORETICAL DISHONESTY

Theoretical dishonesty has become one of the most important weapons in the internal struggle. This fact alone is a sure indication of the deep-seated disease that is consuming the organism of the International. Ideological dishonesty in a revolutionary leadership is the same as slovenliness in a surgeon. The one and the other lead fatally to the poisoning of the organism. However, the theoretical dishonesty of the leadership of the International is neither an accident nor is it a quality peculiar to them: it flows from the contradiction between the principles of Leninism and the actual policy of the Stalinist faction. The less authority and cohesion there are, the greater is the coercion. Discipline, as necessary as salt is to food, has in these last years been found to displace food itself. But no one has yet been able to sustain himself on salt. The selection of persons takes place in conformity with the course and the regime of the Party. The Communist fighters are more and more replaced by the bureaucratic staff officers of Communism. This is most clearly and crassly seen in the very focal point of Communist leadership: the central apparatus of the International.

Accordingly, it is of the highest importance to give an account of the kind of elements, the political type of the representatives who at the present moment hold the reins in the Communist International. I do not possess the general statistics and the political characteristics of the bureaucracy of the International. Moreover, that is not necessary. It is enough to point out with the finger some of the most "conspicuous" figures that personify the present leading line and the present regime.

BELA KUN AND PEPPER

Since I do not pretend to give a systematic study in these rapid notes, and since the gallery of the Stalinist International must be begun with someone, we will first of all name Bela Kun, without wishing thereby to exaggerate his importance either in the good or the bad sense. In all justice it must be recognized that Bela Kun, at any rate, is not the worst element in the leading circles of the International. He is supplemented by two other Hungarian Communists: Varga and Pepper. All three play an international role, appearing almost continuously as teachers and spiritual directors of the national sections. Two of them, Kun and Pepper, are highly qualified specialists in the struggle against "Trotskyism". The short-lived Hungarian Soviet republic still casts a certain luster of authority upon them. Still, it must not be forgotten that these politicians did not have to conquer power; it was foisted upon them by a bourgeoisie that had landed in a blind alley. Having taken power without struggle, the Hungarian leaders more than showed that they were not big enough to keep it. Their policy was a chain of errors. Let us confine ourselves to mentioning two of the links: first of all they forgot the existence of the peasantry by not giving it the land; secondly, in their joy they united the young Communist Party with the Left social democracy as soon as the latter wheeled its way into power. Thus they showed—and Bela Kun in the first place—that the experience of the Russian revolution had taught them to understand neither the peasant question nor the question of the role of the Party in the revolution. Of course, these mistakes, which cost the Hungarian revolution its life, find their explanation in the youth of the Hungarian Party and the extreme lack of political preparation of its leaders. But is it not stupefying that Bela Kun, like his social democratic shadow Pepper, can believe himself called upon to denounce us, Oppositionists, for an underestimation of the peasantry and a lack of understanding of the role of the Party? Where is it written that a man who, out of carelessness, has broken the arms and legs of his intimates, is on this account promoted to the title of Professor of Surgery?

At the Third Congress, Bela Kun, flanked by his indispensable counterpart, Pepper, adopted an ultra-Left position. They defended the strategy employed in Germany in March 1921, of which Bela Kun was one of the principal inspirers. Their point of departure was the following: unless the revolution is immediately aroused in the West, the Soviet republic is doomed to die. Bela Kun endeavored many a time to convince me to "take a chance" along this path. I flatly rejected his putschism, and, together with Lenin, I explained to him at the Third Congress that the task of the European Communists is not to "save" the U.S.S.R. with the aid of revolutionary stage-plays but the serious preparation of the European Parties for the taking of power. Today Bela Kun, with the Peppers of all variety, feels called upon to accuse me of "scepticism" towards the vital forces of the Soviet republic and of "speculating" solely upon the world revolution. What is called the irony of history assumes here the aspect of a veritable buffoonery. Really, it is not an accident that the Third Congress proceeded under the resounding, like a leitmotif, of Lenin's formulation: "All that because of Bela Kun's stupidities." And when afterwards, in my private conversations with Lenin, I tried to defend Bela Kun against too harsh attacks, Lenin answered: "I do not dispute that he is a fighter, but as a politician he is fit for nothing; the comrades must be taught not to take him seriously."

As for Pepper, he is the consummate type of the man who knows how to adapt himself, a political parasite. Such individuals have attached themselves and will always attach themselves to every victorious revolution as unfailingly as flies stick to sugar. After the catastrophe of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, Pepper endeavored to enter into relations with Count Karolyi. At the Third Congress he was with the ultra-Left. In America he became the herald of the LaFollette Party and dragged the young Communist Party into the swamp up to its waist. It is hardly necessary to say that he became a prophet of socialism in one country and one of the most ferocious anti-Trotskyists. Now he has made this his profession, as others run a matrimonial agency or sell lottery tickets.

VARGA

On Varga I must repeat what I have already said, that he is the perfected type of a theoretician a la Polonius, at the service of every leadership of the Communist International. It is true that his knowledge and his analytical qualities make him a useful and qualified worker. But there is not the slightest trace of power of thought or revolutionary will in him. In this regard Varga is a miniature edition of a Kautsky. He was a Brandlerist under Brandler, Maslovist under Maslov, Thaelmannist under the void that is called Thaelmann. Conscientiously and scrupulously, he always serves up the economic arguments for the political line of others. The objective value of his works is entirely limited by the political quality of the instructions upon which he himself has not the least influence. He defends the theory of socialism in one country, as I have once said, by invoking the lack of political culture of the Russian worker who needs "consoling" perspectives.

MANUILSKY

Manuilsky, like Pepper, enjoys a sufficiently established reputation even within the faction to which he now belongs. The last six years have thoroughly debauched this man whose principal quality is his moral inconstancy. There was a time when he had certain talents, not theoretical, not political, but literary. A certain flame, always feeble, burned in him. However, some kind of internal worm gnawed at him incessantly. Fleeing from himself, Manuilsky constantly sought for someone to lean upon. He always had something of the "errand-boy" in him. It suffices to say that for a long time he strove to remain attached to . . . Alexinsky. During the war, Manuilsky did not conduct himself badly. Nevertheless, his internationalism was always superficial. The October days were a period of hesitations for Manuilsky. In 1918, he proclaimed unexpectedly (for me, above all) that Trotsky had liberated Bolshevism from its national narrowness. After all, no one attached any great importance to his writings. Manuilsky lived quietly in the Ukraine as an administrator of little ability, asserting himself, however, as a fine narrator of anecdotes. Like all the present leaders, he came forward and began his rise only after the death of Lenin. His intrigues against Rakovsky served him as a spring-board. The general esteem enjoyed by Rakovsky in the Ukraine was such that in 1923 no one dared to begin a campaign against him, despite all the urgings from Moscow. Manuilsky did dare. In private conversations, between two anecdotes, he openly acknowledged the kind of a commission he was discharging, proclaimed his contempt for his commissioner, and even more, for himself. His acquaintance with foreign countries established the field for his further exploits: the Communist International. If one were to gather what Zinoview and Stalin say about him, he would assemble a very curious treatise on political cynicism. On the other hand, matters would not be changed very much if one gathered what Manuilsky has said about Zinoviev and Stalin. At the Sixth Congress, Manuilsky appeared as the principal accuser of the Opposition. For one who knows the leading personnel and the past of the Party, this fact by itself alone settles the question!

VALETSKY

In the apparatus of the International and in the press, Valetsky plays a very conspicuous role. In Die Kommunistische Internationale and in Pravda he frequently denounces Trotskyism from the "theoretical" and "philosophical" viewpoint. He was created by nature itself for this sort of task. In the eyes of the younger generation Valetsky is simply an illustrious unknown. The older generation has known him for a long time. At the opening of the century, Valetsky made his appearance in Siberian exile as a fanatical supporter of the Polish Socialist Party (P.P.S.). At that time Pilsudski was his god. In politics, Valetsky was a nationalist; in theory, he was an idealist and a mysticist. He became the propagandist for the theory of decadence, and for the belief in God and Pilsudski. In our colony of exiles, he was isolated. At the time of the splitting of the P.P.S., called forth by the revolution of 1905, Valetsky was found on the more "socialist" wing (the Left), but only so as to defend there an extremely Menshevik position.

Already at that time he fought against the theory of the "permanent revolution", regarding not only as fantastic but as senseless the idea that the proletariat could come to power sooner in backward Russia than in Western Europe. During the war, he was at the very best to the Right of Martov. One can be sure that five minutes before the October Revolution, Valetsky was an irreconciliable enemy of Bolshevism. I have no information as to the time when he became a "Bolshevik." But in any case it was not until after the Russian proletariat had taken power firmly in its hands. At the Third Congress, Valetsky tacked about between the line of Lenin and the ultra-Leftists. Under Zinoviev he was a Zinovievist only to change opportunely into a Stalinist. His mobility and his elasticity are not yet exhausted. It is easy for him, with his light baggage, to change from one train to another. Today, this former nationalist, idealist, mysticist, Menshevik teaches the working class how to take power, despite the fact that he himself heard of it for the first time only after it had been conquered. People of the caliber of Valetsky will never conquer anything. But they are perfectly capable of losing that which has been conquered.

TO BE CONTINUED

DANGER SIGNALS IN THE EAST

(*Continued from Page* 1)

ary general", the "leader of the masses", and the like. This cannot be forgotten, for the present situation is the fruit of that policy.

The workers of the world who up to now have shown an alarming in difference and inaction in the present situation must be aroused, and will be aroused if the helm is turned and the defense of the Soviet Union based on a proper foundation: not on the fight for Russian claims in China, but on the genuine danger, that exists daily so long as Russia remains a workers' state, of attack by the White Guards and counter-revolution of world imperialism.

Summing Up the Fur Strike

On June 19, 1929, the New York furriers' strike began under the direction of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union. The Daily Worker of June 20, carried an eight-column headline: "Furriers General Strike Cripples the Industry. Thousands of Workers in Response to Call on the First Day of Struggle". Five weeks later, in an obscure corner of the Daily Worker the announcement was published that the strike had been called off without a successful conclusion.

THE FAILURE TO ESTIMATE THE DEFEAT

One would imagine that when two fights in as many months in the New York needle trades (cloakmaker's strike and furriers' strike) have resulted in two decisive defeats for the Left wing and big gains for the Right wing, the Daily Worker would attempt to make an analysis and draw the proper lessons and conclusions. But not so much as an editorial was written on the matter. The Joint Board of the Union, however, did make a statement pretending to estimate the situation and analyze the shortcomings of the furriers' strike which resulted in such a mortifying defeat for the Left wing. But its statement (Daily Worker, July 24-25, 1929) has no value. It analyzes nothing. It finds nothing wrong with the policies of the Union, but plenty wrong with the ranks of the workers who are filled with "pessimism... fear of right wing terrorism . . . passive." The statement fails to explain why it is that the Left wing which, as late as 1927-28, had a position in the needle trades vastly superior to that of the Right wing, is today no longer followed actively by the majority of the workers; it fails to explain why, to limit ourselves here to the furriers' strike, the workers followed the orders of the employers and the Right wing and remained at work. The Left wing in the needle trades is today weaker than at any previous time in the last five years or more of its history and the reasons for its defeats and weakness must be made plain. A genuine explanation of the recent defeats of the Left wing is imperative, for without it there will be further, more crushing defeats for the Left and progress of the Right wing at the expense of the workers involved.

1. The calling and the calling-off of the furriers' strike were conducted irresponsibly. There was no preparation for the strike. This is virtually admitted when the Joint Board statement says that the workers in the Associated (the manufacturers) shops did not join the strike. These workers are the decisive factor in the industry and are still under the control of the Right wing. Of the 2,000 to 2,500 workers who went out on strike—a meaningless minority of the workers in the New York trade—a large percentage of them were already unemployed.

FOSTER ON RETREATS

The strike was visibly lost in the first week, and all the workers realized it. A responsible leadership would have acknowledged the situation and known how to retreat in time in order to conserve its forces for a new struggle. But the opportunist group whom the Stalinists have put in control of the union, Gold, Zimmerman, Wortis and Co., compelled the strike to drag on until it was beyond exhaustion, rather than admit their failure and mistakes. Only after five weeks was the strike "officially" called off in an out-of-the-way corner of the Party Press. Such a leadership and policy can teach the workers nothing. It has nothing in common with militant unionism; it is reactionary and irresponsible. No less an authority than William Z. Foster once said:

"A common mistake of reactionaries, in case of a lost strike, is not to offically call off the strike. They usually let it drag along interminably, long after it has ceased to exert real pressure against the employers. The consequence is that many loyal workers, who have fought valiantly while there was even a slight chance to win the strike, are forced back to work with the odium of scab upon them. They then are largely lost to the trade union movement. A far more intelligent course is to call off the strike officially when it is manifestly lost, and let the fragments of the defeated army go back to work with honor. It facilitates greatly the reorganization of the workers. It is an important detail in developing an organized retreat."—(Strike Strategy, page 83-4).

That was once. Now Foster, who is in charge of the Party's trade union work, is a silent accomplice to the methods he once condemned.

2. The workers are losing faith in the leadership of the Left wing, not because it follows out the Left wing policy, *but because it does not carry it out.* The Golds and Zimmermans are shouting very radical phrases today, but only so as to cover up their Right wing acts. In 1927, Gold and his fellow opportunists ended the furriers' strike with such a collaborationist agreement that the National Committee of the Young Workers League had to repudiate it publicly in part. In 1929, the agreement made with the bosses in the dressmakere' strike, led by the Left wing union, was so little different from a typical Sigman-Schlesinger-Dubinsky settlement that the T.U.E.L. had to condemn it semi-officially in an article by Philip Aronberg in Labor Unity. The Left wing fought Sigman for his class-collaborationism, for his "impartial arbitrators"; but the Left wing dressmakers' agreement called for the same kind of "impartial" arbitration. It also "forgot" the question of week work, instead of piece work. It failed to make the jobbers responsible for the workers employed by the contractors. The militancy of the workers—not of the leaders—was the only thing to distinguish the strike from one managed by the Right wing.

NEW UNIONS AND THE COMMUNISTS

The Left wing has not made the mass of the workers feel at home in the new union. The Party hugs the new union to death. It is so fearful of losing its grip that it establishes a devitalizing mechanical control in the organization. Only Party members—and often only members of a certain Party faction—are entrusted with responsible offices. Non-Party workers who are most sympathetic with the Left wing are looked upon with suspicion and are alienated. The workers get the feeling that they are merely instruments for maneuvering from the outside, instead of feeling the healthy influence and dominance of Communist ideas acquired by daily experience and intelligent guidance. The Left wing union has not the rank and file control it needs: even the shop-delegate system was given an icy reception at the union's foundation convention. The atmosphere in and about the union is more that of a political Party than a trade union sympathetic to the revolutionary movement.

Is it to be wondered that there is passivity, disillusionment, pessimism, and absence of spirit among the workers?

3. In the furriers' strike, as in the cloakmakers', the Left wing nonchalantly threw overboard the powerful slogan of Unity. There was no agitation among the workers in the Right wing union—which, unfortunately, is gaining in members because of the mistakes by the Left—for joint action, struggle, strike against the growing impudence of the bosses and the increasingly rotten conditions suffered by the workers.

The yellow Forward writes that the reason for the defeat of the Left wing in the cloakmakers' strike was that in past years the workers were deceived (!) by the Left wing's cry for unity, but now the Communists have even dropped this cry and the workers are turning back to their tried (!) leaders. Analyzed properly, the words of the Forward should be a source of instruction for the Left wing. It is the Forward and its whole tribe that gain when the Left wing pursues an incorrect policy, when it abandons the struggle for unity. That is why we shall continue to hammer at these truths.

FROM GOMPERS TO STALIN

(The evolution of William Z. Foster)

(In previous issues of The Militant we have given the political biographies of a number of the Party leaders—Lovestone, Pepper, Wolfe, etc.—who had charge of the slander campaign against the Opposition Communists. The removal from leadership of this shady crew has been followed by the appointment of others, with Foster as the chief, and the latter, after a long silence, has begun to hurl the words "counter-revolutionist" and "renegade" at the opponents of Stalinism. In order that his qualification for this occouption may be established, we print here some facts about his record which are certified correct by Foster himself, by Gompers and Fitzpatrick. The material printed below consists of extracts from the published stenographic record of the Senate investigation of the Steel Strike in 1919. The published volume is entitled: "Investigation of Strike in Steel Industries. Hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate—Sixty-sixth Congress, first session. Pursuant to S. Res. 202 on the Resolution of the Senate to investigate the Strike in the Steel Industries"

It would not be necessary to bring this record to public notice again were it not for the fact that only by a study of Fosters' past can his present Centrist fight against the revolutionary line of Opposition be explained.)

FOSTER AND GOMPERS

FITZPATRICK. He (Foster) is not preaching and is absolutely confining himself to the activities and scope of the American Federation of Labor, and has done so for the years that I have known him. This is not a new thing for me. I have known Foster for probably six or seven years. (Page 75).

THE CHAIRMAN. Have you ever discussed this book (Syndicalism) with him at all?

MR. FITZPATRICK. Oh, he joked about the views he had in his younger days, when he associated with men who were actuated with radical thoughts, and he was imbued by it, but when he got both his feet on the ground and knew how to weigh matters with better discretion and more conscience, he had forgot all of those things that he learned when he was a boy, and is now doing a man's thinking in the situation. (Page 76).

GOMPERS: About a year after that meeting at Zurich—no, about two years after the Zurich meeting, (where Foster had appeared as an International delegate of the I. W. W.—Ed.) and about a year after that pamphlet ("Syndicalism") had been printed, I was at a meeting of the Chicago Federation of Labor, conducted under the presidency of Mr. John Fitzpatrick. I was called upon to make and did make an address. One of the delegates arose after I had concluded and expressed himself that it would be wise for the men in the labor movement of Chicago and of the entire country to follow the thought and philosophy and so forth which President Gompers had enunciated in his address. I did not know who was the delegate. He was a new personality to me. I might say that I was rather flattered and pleased at the fact that there was general comment of approval of not only my utterances but of the delegate who had first spoken after I had concluded.

Much to my amazement, after the meeting was over I was informed that the delegate was W. Z. Foster, the man who had appeared in Zurich and the man who had written that pamphlet. I think I addressed a letter to him expressing my appreciation of his change of attitude, his change of mind, and pointing out to him that pursuing a constructive policy he could be of real service to the cause of labor. He was a man of ability, a man of good presence, gentle in expression, a commander of good English, and I encouraged him. I was willing to help build a golden bridge for mine enemy to pass over. I was willing to welcome an erring brother into the ranks of constructive labor. (Pages 111-112).

FOSTER: I am one who changes his mind once in a while. I might say that other people do. I shook hands with Gustave Herve in La Sante Prison. At that time he was in there for anti-militarism and for preaching sabotage, and today I think Gustave Herve (Herve had turned Socialist Patriot—Ed.) is one of the biggest men in France—Page 396).

THE CHAIRMAN (To Foster): But at that time, when you were advocating the doctrines of the I. W. W. through the country and abroad, you were running counter to the policies of the American Federation of Labor?

FOSTER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gompers, however, has not changed his views concerning the I. W. W., but your views have changed?

FOSTER: I don't think Mr. Gompers views have changed—only to become more pronounced, possibly.

CHAIRMAN: And you say now to the Committee that your views have so changed that you are in harmony with the views of Mr. Gompers?

FOSTER: Yes, sir, I don't know that it is 100 percent, but in the main they are. (Page 423).

FOSTER AND THE WAR

SENATOR WALSH: What was his attitude toward this country during the war, if you know?

MR. FITZPATRICK: Absolutely loyal, and he did everything in his power to assist in every way. I worked with him. I worked with him during the whole of the war, and I know the service that he rendered to the country. I think that he rendered as great a service, not only to the United States Government, but to the Allies, as any man. (Page 75-76).

SENATOR WALSH (to Foster): What was your attitude toward this country during the war?

FOSTER: My attitude toward the war was that it must be won at all costs.

SENATOR WALSH: Some reference was made by Mr. Fitzpatrick about your purchasing bonds or your subscribing to some campaign fund. Do you mind telling the committee what you did personally in that direction?

FOSTER: I bought my share, what I figured I was able to afford, and in our union we did our best to help make the loans a success.

WALSH: Did you make speeches?

FOSTER: Yes, sir.

WALSH: How many?

FOSTER: Oh, dozens of them.

WALSH: I would like to have you, for the sake of the record, teli us how many speeches you made, what time you devoted, and what money you expended for bonds, for the Red Cross or for any other purposes.

FOSTER: Well, I think I bought either $450 or $500 worth of bonds during the war. I cannot say exactly.

WALSH: You made speeches for the sale of bonds?

FOSTER: We carried on a regular campaign in our organization in the stockyards.

WALSH: And your attitude was the same as the attitude of all the other members of your organization?

FOSTER: Absolutely. (Pages 398-399).

On the International Right Wing

A Letter to Boris Souvarine by L. D. Trotsky

NOTE

The letter written by comrade Trotsky to Boris Souvarine deals essentially with the standpoint of the Leninist Opposition towards the Brandler-Thalheimer group in Germany. Nevertheless, all that is said in the letter applies with multiplied force to the Right Wing group now being formed inside and outside the Communist Party of the United States. The letter of comrade Trotsky, with which the Communist League of America (Opposition) is in thorough accord, will therefore also serve as a final reply to the present Stalinist leaders of the Party who are seeking to drown out the echoes of their many years of cooperation with the international Right Wing in the Comintern and its American section, the Lovestone group, by shouting at the top of their lungs that we are now "in alliance with Lovestone"... Every serious worker will realize the obvious impossibility of an alliance between the Leninist wing of the Communist movement and the Thermidorian Right Wing, in the fight against which the Opposition was born and developed, and will finally conquer.—Editor.

I received your letter of April 16th, which astonished me somewhat. You emphasize that you expected something else from me with regard to the foreign Opposition groups.

I should not express myself right away, but first observe study, gather groups and people who are able to think and act as Marxists. You reproach me with acting precipitately and warn me that I will surely repent not having left myself the time to observe, reflect and to discuss.

In your criticism, which I notice with pleasure, is made in a very friendly tone, there is displayed the entire incorrectness of your present attitude. You must be aware of the fact that up till now I have not expressed myself on a single one of the disputed internal questions that divide the French, German, Austrian and other Opposition groups. For the last year I have been too far apart from the life of the European Parties and I really need time to familiarize myself with general political conditions as well as with the Opposition groups. If I have nevertheless expressed myself on the latter, it was only with regard to those three questions that serve as fundamental questions of our period: The internal policies in the U.S.S.R., the leadership of the Chinese revolution and the Anglo-Russian Committee. Is it not strange that you propose that precisely in these three questions I should not be precipitate, that I should gain time, to inform myself and to reflect? At the same time you yourself do not relinquish your right to express yourself openly on these three questions and what is more in a sense directly opposed to the decisions that form the real basis of the Left, Leninist Opposition.

POSITION OF THE BRANDLER GROUP

I declared in the press that I was completely ready to correct or to change my estimation of the Brandler group or their like in case I am informed of any new facts or documents. The Brandler group then very obligingly sent me all the writings published by them. In *Arbeiter-Politik* of March 16 I found Thalheimer's report on the Russian discussion. As a matter of fact I did not need much time for study and reflection in order to establish that the Brandler-Thalheimer group stands on the other side of the barricades. Let us remember some facts:

1. In 1923 this group did not grasp the revolutionary situation, nor did it understand how to utilize it.

2. In 1924 Brandler endeavored to see the revolutionary situation immediately ahead of him and not behind him.

3. In 1925 he declared that there had been no revolutionary situation at all, only an overestimation on Trotsky's part.

4. In 1925-26-27 he was of the opinion that the course based on the Kulak, the Stalin-Bucharin course of that time, was correct.

5. In 1923-25 Thalheimer—as a member of the Program Commission—supported Bucharin against me in the essential program question (empty schema of national-capitalism, instead of the theory of the connection of world economy and world politics).

6. So far as I know, Brandler and Thalheimer never raised their voice against the theory of socialism in a single country.

7. Brandler and Thalheimer sought to attain the leadership of the Party by availing themselves of the protective coloration of Stalin (as Foster does in America).

8. In the question of the Chinese revolution Brandler and Thalheimer hobbled along behind the official leadership.

9. The same thing in the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

And so I have before me the experience of a six-year period. It must be known to you that in the condemnation of Brandler I was in no way precipitate.

After the frightful collapse of the German Revolution of 1923 I gave Brandler a qualified protection; I declared it undeserved to put him up as the scapegoat when the responsibility for the catastrophe in Germany lay with the Zinoviev-Stalin leadership of the Comintern as a whole. I reached a negative estimation of Brandler only when I became convinced that he did not for a single moment want to, nor could he, learn from the great events. His retrospective estimation of the German situation of 1923 is quite similar to the criticism that the Mensheviks developed on the 1905 revolution in the years of the reaction. I had enough time to "reflect" on all this.

THALHEIMER ON THE RUSSIAN DISCUSSION

The whole report of Thalheimer on the Russian discussion can be summed up in one sentence: "Trotsky's program demands a stronger financial pressure on the peasantry." Thalheimer plays variations on this sentence in his whole report. Can there be a more shameful position for a Marxist? The real question begins for me with the negation of the peasantry as a whole. It is a question of the class struggle within the peasantry. The Opposition raised the demand to free forty to fifty percent of the peasantry from taxes entirely. Since 1923 the Opposition always warned that the retardation in industry would signify the price scissors and consequently also the strongest and most destructive exploitation of the lowest sections of the village by the Kulaks, the middlemen and the tradesmen.

The middle section of the peasantry presents a social protoplasm. Uninterruptedly and unalterably, it assumes certain forms in two directions: in the capitalist direction through the Kulaks, and in the socialist direction through the semi-proletarians and the agricultural workers. Whoever ignores this basic process, whoever speaks of the peasantry in general, whoever does not see that the "peasantry" has two hostile faces, is irretrievably lost. The problem of the Thermidor and Bonapartism is fundamentally the problem of the Kulaks. Whoever overlooks this problem, minimizes its significance by seeking to draw off attention to the questions of the Party regime, of bureaucracy, of dirty polemical methods and other phenomena and manifestations of the offensive of the Kulaks against the dictatorship of the proletariat, resembles a doctor who hunts for the symptoms without noticing the functional and organic disorders.

At the same time, Thalheimer repeats like a well-coached parrot that the demand presented by us for the secret ballot in the Party is—"Menshevism". He must surely know that the worker-members of the R. C. P. do not trust themselves to speak, to vote according to their conscience. They are afraid of the apparatus which transmits the pressure of the Kulak, of the official, of the specialist (technical specialist), of the petty-bourgeoisie, of the foreign bourgeoisie. Of course the Kulak also wants secret voting in the Soviets, for he too is troubled by the apparatus which still stands, as always, under the pressure of the workers. These are precisely the elements of the dual power, covered up by the Centrist bureaucracy which maneuvers between classes and just because of that continuously undermines the positions of the proletariat. The Mensheviks want secret voting for the Kulak and the petty-bourgeois in the Soviets—against the workers, against the Communists. I want secret voting for the worker-Bolsheviks in the Party—against the bureaucrats, against the Thermidorians. But since Thalheimer belongs to those who overlook the classes, he declares the demands of the Leninist-Opposition identical with the demands of the Mensheviks. With this nonsense he seeks to mask his purely bourgeois position in the peasant question.

THE SECRET BALLOT

Naturally the secret ballot in the Party will be utilized not only by the worker-Bolsheviks but also by their enemies who have penetrated the Party. In other words, the class struggle within the Communist Party, now suppressed under the lid of the Bonapartist apparatus, will make its way into the open. That is just what we want. The Party will see itself as it really is. That would mean a real self-cleansing of the Party—as a counterpoise to that bureaucratically falsified purging that the apparatus is again undertaking in the interest of its self-preservation. Only after the cleansing of the Party in the above-mentioned sense can the secret ballot be carried over into the trade unions. After a number of years of the bureaucratic levelling of the trade unions we will be able to establish only in this way how great the influence of the Mensheviks, the Social Revolutionaries and the White Guards is in reality. Without seriously fathoming the whole class it will be impossible to hold firmly to the real dictatorship of the proletariat. At present, the diseases have been driven inside to such an extent that extraordinary measures are necessary to bring them to the surface. One of these measures, not the only one, to be sure, should be precisely the demand for the secret ballot in the Party and then also in the trade unions.

So far as the Soviets are concerned, the question will first be decided after the experiences in the Party and in the proletarian factory organizations.

In all the basic questions of the world revolution and the class struggle, Brandler and Thalheimer joined with Stalin-Bucharin, who, precisely in these questions (China, English trade unions, peasantry), were supported by the social democracy. Nevertheless, Thalheimer defines as Menshevism the demand for the secret ballot for the proletarian vanguard against the apparatus which is carrying out Menshevism with the methods of terror.

Can one imagine a more wretched bankruptcy of ideas? I do not doubt that there are many workers in and around the Brandler group who, sickened with the sordid management of Thaelmann and Co., leave their Party, but have not found their way to the right door. The Leninist-Opposition must help these workers to find their way in the situation. But this can only be achieved in an irreconcilable and relentless struggle against the political course of Brandler-Thalheimer and all those groups that solidarize with them or actually support them.

THE VACILLATORS

The Stalin course in the Comintern has not yet spoken its last word. We are only entering upon a series of crises, splits, groupings and convulsions. Many years of work stand before us. Not everyone will measure up to it. You speak of the vacillations of Radek, Smilga and Preobrazhenski. I know all that very well. They are vacillating not for the first day, not for the first month, not even for the first year. It was always noteworthy in the highest degree that these comrades vacillated or adopted an incorrect position in the basic questions of the international revolution. Radek defended the incorrect line in the question of China, the Anglo-Russian Committee, and up to 1927 he was doubtful if after all any other economic course than that of Stalin-Bucharin was possible. Preobrazhenski adopted a quite false position in the Chinese question as well as in the question of the Comintern program (conciliatory attitude towards national-socialism). Smilga, together with Radek, was against the withdrawal of the Communist Party from the Kuo Min Tang, against the slogan of the dictatorship of the Chinese proletariat during the revolutionary period and against the slogan of the legislative national assembly in the period of the counter-revolution. The present vacillations of the above-named comrades in the question of Party organization are the consequences of the confusion and halfness of their general theoretical and political attitude. It was ever thus and thus it shall ever be.

Lenin taught us not to fear the departure, the splitting off, the desertion even of very respectable, influential comrades. In the final analysis the correctly maintained political line decides. To be able to hold to a correct line in a period of political ebb, of the offensive of the bourgeoisie, the social democracy and the Right-Centrist bloc in the Comintern (these are manifestations of one and the same condition)—that is now the main duty of a proletarian revolutionary. The correct estimation of the epoch and its dynamic forces, the correct prevision of the morrow will force all the really revolutionary elements of the working class to regroup themselves and to unite around the Bolshevik banner. That is my opinion on all these questions. That is how I see the things.

I would be glad if you could associate yourself with the above-mentioned observations. That would give us the possibility of working together. I am quite aware of how useful such a collaboration would be for our cause.

Constantinople, April 25, 1929. L. D. TROTSKY.

The Rumor Factory

The Daily Worker and the Freiheit have both published stories about an alleged Trotskyist named Konikov from Boston, who is working with the Right Wing in the Independent Workmen's Circle against the Communists and the Left Wing. As the correspondents and scribblers of these Stalinist organs know perfectly well, the Konikov involved has nothing whatsoever to do with the Opposition, unless it is by virtue of the fact that he is the former husband of one of our Boston comrades, Dr. Antoinette Konikov. But the Freiheit and Worker writers have had enough experience writing in the past for the yellow Jewish Forward and the capitalist press to utilize this pretty trick against an inconvenient opponent . . .

Our Minneapolis comrades inform us that the Stalinists there are busily engaged in spreading the story that comrade Martin Abern has sold out, left the Natl. Committee of the Opposition and become organizer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union in St. Louis, while comrade Max Shactman was made organizer for the A. C. W. in Cleveland. We hear that we have also joined first with the Muste group and secondly that we are in joint committees with the Lovestone faction. Really, after our "alliance" with the Hoover and the Austrian government, our "new alliances" should be considered a step forward!

Lovestones Appeal To Party

By Max Shachtman

Less than one-tenth of the appeal to the International now being circulated secretly among the Party membership by Lovestone, Gitlow, Wolfe, Miller, Myerscough, Welsh and White, is devoted to any differences in platform or principle it may or may not have with the present leadership and line of Stalin and the American Party leadership; and this is entirely characteristic of the present unprincipled struggle between the Right and Center wings of the Communist movement. Lovestone, even less so than Bucharin or Brandler, has not yet completely unfurled his programmatic banner. He is recruiting the forces for his faction *first;* he will develop his platform in full *later*. Here again he is only following in the foot-steps of his new masters: Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsky.

Lovestone's document, therefore, is mainly a personal factional polemic against his opponents, a printed edition of the underground mimeographed caucus circulars that corrupted the movement for years. What he succeeds in proving to the hilt in his appeal is that the personnel of the newly-concocted leadership is man for man no better, and in many respects worse,—from the political and moral viewpoint—than the crew that Lovestone has managed to recruit.

Place the Daily Worker's frothing next to Lovestone's appeal and you will have a rounded-out picture of the whole leadership that earned its spurs in the struggle against the Bolshevik Opposition—from Lovestone through the gamut of the Weinstones, Bedachts, Stachels and Johnstones to Foster. Each is a sample —Lovestone's more than the Stalinists'—of the friendly thieves of yesterday who have finally fallen out. Here is how Lovestone characterizes six of the men with whom he collaborated most intimately in the Party and in caucus for the last half a decade or more:

"Degenerated elements from the former majority leadership of the Party—precisely those elements which are ideologically weakest, most factional, most unprincipled and guilty of committing the worst Right-wing errors. Minor (the alliance with Sydney Hillman against the Communists and the Left-wing, the proposal to desert the central field of the mining struggle, the repeated opportunist errors of the Daily Worker under his editorship); Weinstone (a co-father with Cannon of the National Opposition Bloc condemned by the Communist International; a congenital petty bourgeois vacillator notorious for careerism and most unprincipled striving for office as best exemplified in the body-snatching role he played when he threw the Party into a factional struggle upon the death of Comrade Ruthenberg in order to secure for himself the National Secretaryship; the Panken case, the New York cooperatives, the painters, fraction, the Electrical Workers' Union, etc.); Stachel (joined Party only in 1924 and never participated in any of the mass work of the Party, professional trickster, petty bureaucrat deeply distrusted by even his closest co-workers and shared most of the errors of Weinstone enumerated above); Bedacht (Social Democratic attitude toward the youth; the Milwaukee Socialist Party alliance, the Right-wing capitulatory policy in the mining campaign, crassly social-democratic literature in Chicago in the last election, surrender to Dr. Wanbasse at the last Cooperative League Convention); Ballam (notoriously lazy and incompetent and permanently on the auction block, chronic unprincipled factionalist and propounder of the fantastic counter-revolutionary doctrine that the Communist International through the Address is attempting to weaken the American Party in order to gain for Soviet Russia, American credits and recognition); Wicks (deserted the Party during the first government attack, furiously attacking the Party from outside, Lynch alliance in the Typographical Union unanimously condemned by Fourth Congress of Party for this opportunist policy."

But these were precisely the "deserters, petty-bourgeois vacillators, careerists, opportunists, bureaucrats and fakers" that formed Lovestone's main strength in the Party, his closest colleagues, whom he protected and defended, who formed his "Marxian trunk" and his Bolshevik "old guard"! What he says about them all is quite true, and more might be added. We only await the moment when he will fall out with Gitlow and Wolfe, and then remind us how Wolfe cravenly deserted the Party twice and ran from the police;

Lovestone was put out of the way by Stalin because he was an American base for Bucharin, just as Bucharin and Stalin put Fischer, Maslov, Treint and Neurath out of the way because they were bases for Zinoviev in 1925. All the other accusations against Lovestone are after thoughts. It avails Lovestone nothing to point out the unquestionable fact that the Comintern has supported him and his group for the last four years and helped to crush any opposition to his dominance. Lovestone was supported so long as the Right Center Bloc was in operation in the Russian Party and the International. When the crisis overtook this bloc, and only then, did Lovestone fall from grace.

THE "SPECULATION" ON BUCHARIN AND STALIN

Lovestone, like Bucharin, like Stalin, hoped that the differences in the bloc could be patched together in the interests of a solid front against the Leninist Opposition. That is why, on the eve and after our expulsion, we were damned so violently by both Lovestone and Foster for "speculating" on the differences in the Russian Party, which everyone protested did not exist. That is why Lovestone speaks only now—a year after the event—of the famous anti-Bucharin "Corridor Congress" that was the talk of Moscow during the sessions of the Sixth Comintern Congress, the "Corridor Congress led by the Neumanns, Lominadzes and Bittelmans, but secretly supported by more powerful forces", i. e., by Stalin. Lovestone, who has as little principle as the Stalinists who now condemn him, was hoping for a new consolidation of Bucharin and Stalin that would leave him more firmly intrenched in the American Party leadership, a hope based upon the fervent speeches of Stalin himself, made only a few months ago, which denied the "counter-revolutionary Trotskyist slanders" of a breach in the Russian Party or its leadership.

The notorious anti-Bucharin resolution proposed by Lovestone and Gitlow at the last Party convention was therefore a last-minute act of desperation, an attempt to "get straight" with the new leading faction in the Comintern. Lovestone now reveals the whole self-condemnatory and squalid story of this resolution, and the story sheds no glory either on his former faction colleagues or their Fosterite opponents. The resolution was written by Minor and Bedacht and proposed by the faction to the convention, although Lovestone now claims that he opposed the whole affair. Johnstone, speaking to the convention in the name of the minority, declared that it "would not permit this Convention to get away with a mere declaration on policy but would force it to take an open vote on the condemnation of comrade Bucharin by name." The two Comintern representatives, Dengel and Pollitt, made it plain to the Lovestonites "that the E. C. C. I. considers us Bucharinites and that this fact influenced the judgement of the E. C. C. I. on the American question. We were informed that our repeated declarations on policy to the contrary were insufficient to clear us from this suspicion. We were told that our declaration would have to be much more specific, would have to mention names". Then, only after the Fosterite minority and Weinstone had each introduced resolutions condemning Bucharin by name and indorsing Stalin similarly, did Lovestone introduce his resolution! This, briefly, is the sordid history of the game of wire-pulling that passes for political struggle today.

LOVESTONE'S CABLEGRAM

The same is more or less true with the case of the incredible telegram sent by Lovestone from Moscow-Berlin to his caucus in the United States, outlining steps for taking over the Party apparatus and properties in defiance of any decision by the Comintern. The Bedachts, Stachels and Minors are now violently outraged at their former leader for having conceived such a telegram. But Lovestone proves that while he may be a scamp, his former friends are not innocents abroad.

First, the cable was drafted by Lovestone, Wolfe, Gitlow and Bedacht. Secondly, "Stachel and Minor fully agreed with this policy before the delegation left. In fact, Stachel and Minor prepared a list of names of comrades to whom all Party property could be transferred in case the C. I. would decide...to turn the Party over to the Minority... Stachel, even before the Delegation left for Moscow, arranged with one of the attorneys handling the Party's legal matters, to make it impossible for Weinstone to take away thru legal channels, the Workers Center from the Party in New York." Thirdly, Stachel and Minor, the recipients of the cable, concealed the cable from the Party for almost three weeks; "if Stachel, Minor, Ballam, Puro, Engdahl, Olgin, Mindel were immediately convinced that it was a Party-splitting cable, why did they keep it a secret for so long?... And why doesn't Stachel tell the Party and the C. I., how it is that this cable is made public only now when the New York national Majority top caucus decided to burn it and he, Stachel, guaranteed its being destroyed?"

Only lack of space prohibits us from quoting futher from Lovestone's proofs of the utter depravity of such people as Minor and Stachel, these glowing torches of Party "enlightment". But a few words must be added on the odious role played by the paragon of self-pollution, Bedacht, over whose "honorable, manly and Bolshevik self-criticism" Earl Browder recently went into panegyrics of praise.

Bedacht earned his laurels, and membership on the almighty Party secretariat, by his indignant denunciation of Lovestone for all his crimes, and for a "self-criticism" of his own—only, Bedacht neglected to "admit" those "mistakes" that serve as the most damning indictment of him. We mention only a few. When it became know that Stalin had decided in advance to condemn the Lovestone group, "Comrade Bedacht proposed that we demand our passports". It was Bedacht who participated in the sending of the Lovestone splitting cable from Moscow. And when he had had his fill of Stalin's intrigues, "it was Bedacht who proposed in Moscow to comrades Gitlow, Lovestone and Wolfe to establish connections with Brandler and to keep a permanent representative in Berlin." It was Bedacht who drafted the aggressive Lovestone delegation statement on May 9th. And finally, it was Bedacht who wrote the letter to Wolfe, who was then in Moscow, on February 20, 1929, in which he gave his opinions of that eminent paladin of Bolshevism, Comrade Goldfarb-Petrovsky-Bennett-Williams as follows:

BEDACHT ON GOLDFARB-BENNETT

"We are living in an almost impossible atmosphere. After we were told to fight it out, at the World Congress, and after we fought it out to live in constant expectation that some Goldfarbian cable will nullify the whole history of the last few months and will declare that the membership of our Party proposes and God Goldfarb disposes.

"I have told you in my last letter and I repeat here that the role played by the Goldfarbs creates a most impossible relation with the Comintern. No edict of any person or any body can establish confidence of our Party members in the face of the Comintern if this face is that of an old Menshevik whose outstanding contribution to American Party history is his alliance with Abe Cahan and his right wing gangster tactics in the struggle against Left wing. No matter how loud he hollers now about Bolshevism, he cannot drown the sound of his past tirades against the Left wing in the American S. P. and he cannot eradicate his history. It is a bitter experience for us who have gone thru the struggle against the Goldfarbs here, against his counter-revolutionary Menshevik conceptions and tactics, to be now treated like schoolboys by the same Goldfarb, posing as a school master of Bolshevism. That makes not only a cat laugh but also makes angels weep.

"Deceit and hypocricy are not yet recognized Bolshevik methods and we refuse to use them, as well as we refuse to be made victims of them."

What has happened since this letter was written that has changed the character of Goldfarb to such an extent that Bedacht finds himself able to take orders from him in the Secretariat and the Political Bureau, and hail his ignorance as the apex of Leninist wisdom? Goldfarb has not changed; Bedacht has.

The essence of Lovestone's document is his appeal for leadership of the Party, based on two claims: his past loyalty to the Comintern, and his struggle against and final expulsion of the Communist Opposition. His claims for leadership are as valid as the ones of those who replaced him. Not valid at all are his complaints "we have the unprecedented situation in the Party in which comrades fear to express their opinions. Discussion is being stiffled... The 'enlightenment campaign' is a campaign of terror paralyzing the Party." It was the Lovestones throughout the International who were the heartiest protagonists of the regime of terror against the Leninist Opposition. It was they who stifled discussion. It was they who expelled their Leninist critics, made gangster attacks upon them, imprisoned and exiled them. Lovestone applauded this regime for years, and even called for more violent measures; in the United States he practiced these methods upon us. Who will give his pleas for "Party democracy" a penny of credit?

The Party is in a bitterly critical situation. But Lovestone can offer no way out since he was and is one of the main causes of the crisis. It was his management of the Party for four years that brought it to its present pass. He is as incapable of solving the situation as he is of analyzing it.

Lovestone represents the American section of the International Right wing of Communism, the bannerbearer in Russia of the Thermidorian elements. He and his represent the policy and interests of one class and we of another. His demand for Party democracy, like Brandler's, may appear superficially to be similar to ours. The same may appear true on other fields. But the demands of the Leninist Opposition are raised to subserve certain class interests which are antagonistic to the class interests represented by the Right Wing. When we demand Party democracy, or a correct trade union policy, it is for the purpose of strengthening the working class Bolshevik elements in the movement. When it is demanded by Lovestone, it is for the purpose of gaining free play for interests alien to the working class that have seeped into the Communist movement. That is why any collaboration or a common line btween us is impossible, all the malicious talk of the Weinstones, Fosters and Petrovskys to the contrary notwithstanding.

Nor can a way out be offered by that wierd Stalinist amalgam of Centrism which has been imposed upon the Party, a leadership without line or lineage, still bound politically and theoretically by a hundred threads to the Right wing, before whom it is ready to capitulate in every crisis, with whom it is ready to make an intimate bloc, as it has done in the past, in order to fight the Left.

A solution can be had only on the basis of principle, after the adoption of the tried line of Lenin which has been thrown overboard, after the readmission of the International Opposition which has made this line its own. There is no other way out of the present swamp.

All Quiet on the Unity Front

From a very well informed Party sourse we learn the following information about contemplated changes within the organization as the various little groups of Stalinists (all of them united, you understand) continue to jockey for position:

Robert Minor is to remain nominal editor of the Daily Worker, for the time being, with the threat that the redoubtable Harry M. Wicks, may take his place. Earl Browder, however, has the thankless task of being "politically in charge", i.e., of commissaring Minor. Fralkin, who is more than suspected of having sympathies for Lovestone, is to be replaced as business manager by Wagenknecht.

I. L. D. REORGANIZED AGAIN

The I.L.D. has been re-organized for the third time in nine months since the removal of Cannon, Abern and Shachtman for their support to the Leninist Opposition. The Wagenknecht-Tallentire administration had a swift collapse; it was followed by the Poyntz-Hacker combination which reached its high point of efficiency in a struggle between the two as to who would sign the checks. Now J. Louis Engdahl is to be made national secretary and he is sure to bring enough of his inherent bombast into the organization to put the finishing touches to the work. A. Jakira, who was so phenomenally successful in reducing the Pittsburgh District Party membership to a shadow of what it was before he became district organizer there, is rewarded for jumping off the Lovestone bandwagon in time by being made national organizational secretary of the I.L.D. George Maurer, who is one of the original faithful, becomes editor of the Labor Defender. The I.L.D.—in view of the "Third Period"—has become very revolutionary lately. It thunderously condemns the Civil Liberties Union, the I.W.W., the A.F. of L., the Socialist Party, Mooney, the Centralia prisoners with equal courage. It also gives its unqualified endorsement to the Communist Party, the Trade Union Unity Congress. The I.L.D. has become very radical.

In Pittsburgh, Pat Toohey has resigned as national secretary of the National Miners Union, evidently in accordance with the views of Lovestone whom he supports. The other proletarian fig-leaf of the Lovestone faction, William White, didn't get a chance to resign. He has been replaced as I.L.D. secretary in Pittsburgh by one of the graduates from the so-called Lenin School, Max Salzman, whose diploma was found to be duly signed and sealed by Stalin. Pat Devine has been changed from District Organizer in Minneapolis to the same position in Pittsburgh. In the meantime, the Minnesota proletariat palpitates in anguished anxiety over the selection of its next leader. Devine's solitary contribution to Communist work in the Twin Cities was his expulsion of the most able and experienced Communists from the Party for their views on the Opposition. There is no written record of any other accomplishment by him.

Unity has also been established in the T.U.E.L. John Williamson has been made assistant national secretary. His former minority group association has been balanced off by making the former majority group member, Karl Reeve, editor of Labor Unity. This anaemic sheet, starved for the last few months by its sterile editor, Hathaway, is now doomed in the name of unity to suffer the really pitiful fate of falling into the hands of so eminent an incompetent as Reeve. The patriarchal Ballam, who is distinguished from Reeve only by his age, has been made representative to the R.I.L.U. This pension was awarded him for his successful jump from the Lovestone camp to the C. I. band-wagon in the nick of time. Nevertheless, he goes "across" only by default: Foster failed to make the necessary fight for a more deserving toiler.

CHICAGO GETS A GRADUATE

Chicago is being blessed with the appointment of C. A. Hathaway as district organizer; he also waves his "Lenin School" diploma on all occasions and his uniform is now an Open Sesame. He replaces William Kruse, who cast his lot with Lovestone and was removed. Kruse recently distinguished himself by proposing that the Chicago proletariat give up capturing the streets on International Red Day, and capture the woods instead by attending a picnic on August 1st. Sam Don has been offered the post of organization secretary in Chicago, but at the moment of going to press, he has not yet made up his mind whether the "Center" will be able to get along well enough without him in New York.

In New York, Benjamin has been removed as head of the Workers School and Agit-Prop director for supporting Lovestone. His place has been taken by Sam Darcy, who can write as dull and windy a thesis as any of them. Gusakoff has been yanked out of his New Jersey organizership for the same reason, and his place taken by the obedient Nat Kaplan, who all but captured the carmen's strike the first day of his job. Here, as in the case of most of the changes, it is substituting Tweedledum for Tweedledee.

Stachel, who is a cheap edition of Lovestone, has replaced Minor on the Political Committee, since the C.I. representative doesn't think much of the latter! No one knows who is the secretary of the Party, and not many care. The fact of the matter is, of course, that the C.I. Commission is holding the Party in receivership; the Polcom members are too timid, loyal, obedient and Bolshevized to do anything but cry "Ditto" to anything that "George Williams" hands down from Mt. Sinai. The Almighty Williams has finally decided that a Plenum of the Central Committee can be risked in about 4 weeks, when the Polcom and the Secretariat will be re-organized again and unity established more firmly than ever before . . .

The Aftermath of 'Red Day'

The international "Red Day" demonstrations organized by the Communist International on August 1st were precisely what the Opposition foretold they would be: artificially inflated actions that only demonstrated the growing weakness of the official Communist Parties and their tremendous loss of influence upon the workers. In some places this was proved more strikingly than in others, but everywhere the Parties failed by miles even to approach the aims originally set by the organizers of "Red Day". The Stalinists succeeded more in exposing their own weakness and internal collapse than they did in exposing the growing danger of imperialist war. The net result of the affair is another set-back for the Communist movement.

These sad facts cannot be covered up, even if the official Party press were to mispresent the situation twice as much as they have been doing. The policy of falsehood and self-delusion serve only temporary ends, and even those are of an injurious nature to the working class movement. Therefore the facts must be recapitulated here so that a proper evaluation of the August 1st demonstration can be made.

THE MASSES AND "RED DAY"

In no country (outside of the Soviet Union, of course) did the workers "take possession of the streets" Either they held theirmeetings without any appreciable interference by the police, as in Berlin's Lustgarten, or, where the authorities were determined that no meetings were to be held, as in Paris, no meettings were held—unless the scattered, disorganized and futile turnout of a few hundred or more workers can be entitled a demonstration. Most depressing is the fact that where the police proceeded with particular violence and arbitrary measures against the demonstrations, as in Czecho-Slovakia, China, France or Finland, the Communist Parties showed themselves entirely incapable of arousing the masses of the workers to fight back. In such instances, the Communists and they very closest sympathizers fought alone. The *working class masses* did not rally to them. Under the best of conditions, the demonstrations were attended by no greater number of workers than are to be found at the average mass meeting held during some regular campaign of the Party. In such countries as England, the "demonstrations" were a series of miserable debacles.

In the United States, the "huge demonstrations" existed largely in the columns of the Daily Worker, which has over again justified the view current in the International that it is the worst and most unreliable Communist paper in existence. It did not even have enough sense to lie with consistency. For example, the New York demonstration, attended by 5,000 to 6,000 workers, was reported in huge headlines: "20,000 NEW YORK WORKERS DEMQNSTRATE AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR" (August 2). But the review of August 1st by Stachel (August 12) says: "New York City—Main demonstration about 12,000 workers." Forty percent cut off with a stroke of the pen! "MANY THOUSANDS MORE STRIKE" continued the Daily Workers headline on August 2, enlarging on this with: "The 20,000 who gathered in Union Square were only a small fraction of the tens of thousands of New York workers who at the call of the Communist Party of District 2, stopped work at 4 p. m. yesterday." Stachel, however, reports, 10 days later: "The partial information indicates that about 10,000 workers downed tools at 4 p. m." What fraction is 20,000—"only a small fraction"—of 10,000? "Philadelphia and Detroit held big demonstrations... San Francisco witnessed the biggest demonstrations in years," boasts the Daily Worker (August 3), but Stachel forgot this when he reports that "the Philadelphia, Detroit and California districts.... did not organize mass street demonstrations". One day (August 2) the Daily Worker said: "200,000 DEMONSTRATE IN BERLIN" and on the very next day (August 3) its headline says: "140,000 MEET IN BERLIN"! What are sixty thousands here and there to these fearless leaders who have taken possession of the streets! As a matter of fact the recently arrived Berlin papers show that only 30,000 attended!

THE PHRASEMONGERS RANT

And the streets were not only things that were taken possession of. In New York, according to Darcy, (Daily Worker, August 10), "several hundred of the demonstrators marched to the headquarters of the socialist party (and) took possession of the front steps (!) of the socialist party building, the Rand School" What else but unvarnished idiocy can we call such pathetic dilettantism, as well as similar nonsense about "our comrades' guerrila warfare with the police", the "armed camp in Chicago" or "shock troops" We will not speak here of the romanticism of the "uniformed young worker guards". A Martian reader of the Party press would become seriously convinced that we stand before volcanic revolutionary convulsions in the United States, which the Party is prevented from taking proper advantage of solely because of "defeatists and counter-revolutionists".

We proposed that the demonstration be called off. Our estimate was proved correct. It had nothing in common with "defeatism". It is often necessary for the workers to retreat, either because of the immaturity of the situation or lack of revolutionary preparation Lack of preparation there was a-plenty. One has only to read the speeches at the 10th Plenum of the Executive of the Comintern for crushing evidence of that. Read the speeches of the reporter, Barbe, on "International Red Day"; read the speeches of Horner, Semard, Gottwald, Hansen, Jaquemotte, Piatnitsky and Bell. From them you will get a fairly clear picture of the utter lack of preparation by the various Parties of the C. I. for the "Red Day", the absence of any enthusiastic response in the ranks, the universal indifference of the workers as a whole, the absence of any conviction, the depressiveness of the general atmosphere. Then compare their speeches with the light-headed vaporings of one Bewer, of the E. C. C. I., (who is this new mentor of Bolshevism, by the way?): "The excavators (of Paris) managed to break through the police cordon and to demonstrate, true, in torn shirts, true, covered with blood, with great enthusiasm through the boulevards of Paris. Such must be the line of the Comintern." With the Communist Parties weaker, less influential, more torn by dissenssion, more misled and less capable of the taking advantage of a revolutionary situation than at any other time in the last six years, we are condemned as "defeatists" for refusing to fall into line with such phrase-mongering extravaganzas.

Where in Europe the slogans and actions of the Parties were tragic, in the United States they assumed certain aspects of infantilism. After three damaging defeats for the Communist Party and the left wing in New York—in the cloakmakers', furriers' and iron workers' strikes—the Party goes blithely ahead with a call for a general strike on August 1st! The fact that this slogan meant nothing, that not even a sizable minority of the workers heeded it (Stachel says apologetically: "The mobilization of the Needle Trades Industrial Union was not very successful"), does not disturb these irresponsible dabblers in revolution. Nor do they worry a bit about the fact that the serious and significant slogan of general strike becomes dangerously discredited among the workers when it is played with so lightly and unwarrantedly. Never mind; the "Third Period" is broad enough to cover all sins. The debacle of "Red Day" was not the first sin of the Stalinists and it will not be their last.

A Stalinist Provocation

A NEW WEAPON AGAINST THE OPPOSITION—

In the early part of this year, comrade Ugo Girone, a member of the Italian Communist Party, and a refugee from Fascism in France received permission from the Central Committee of the Party to return to Italy so as to bring back his wife. After arriving in Italy, Mussolini's bloodhounds suddenly arrested him in Milan, whence he was transported to Rome for trial. In the meantime, the Party Committee had discovered that comrade Girone is a member of the Central Committee of the Left fraction of the Party (Bordiga group). While he was still in the hands of the Fascist murderers in Rome, the Italian Party press in France and Belgium, as well as the Italian Party organ in New York, Il Lavoratore, published official articles denouncing comrade Girone, declaring publicly that he had gone to Italy secretly to do work for the Opposition among the Party comrades, telling his name, that he was a professor of Avelino, and insisting that he was an Italian citizen, and not as Girone claimed, a citizen of the Argentine Republic. This infamous denunciation, the work of provocateurs or Centrists gone mad, was just what Mussolini was looking for. Fortunately, comrade Girone was able to prove his Argentine citizenship, and the Fascisti were unable to dig up clear evidence that he had engaged in seditious work. Girone is now in France again.